Promoting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion at the UCLA Academic Senate

Report to UCLA Academic Senate Leadership Aileen Liu, Ph.D. May 20, 2021

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Introduction	2
Methodology	3
Findings	4
Recommendations	7
1 Increase diversity of Senate committees and Senate Leadership.	7
2 Create resources to support Senate committees and chairs to engage in DEI work	8
3 Publicize the Senate's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion	10
4 Hold units accountable for improving climate	11
5 Ensure that faculty have the support they need to succeed at UCLA	11
6 Implement practices for mitigating implicit bias.	12
Appendix 1: List of Interviews	13
Appendix 2: Bibliography	14
Appendix 3: UCLA and UC Implicit Bias Trainings	17
Appendix 4: Academic Senate Membership	18

Executive Summary

This report summarizes challenges and opportunities, and offers recommendations for Senate Leadership to consider for promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) at UCLA.¹ The recommendations are based on analysis of interviews with UCLA Senate faculty, reports related to DEI at UCLA and UC, research about implicit bias trainings, and implicit bias trainings.

The recommendations are:

- 1. Increase diversity of Senate committees and Senate Leadership.
 - 1.1 Publish and conduct periodic analyses of Senate committee demographics by gender, race and ethnicity, discipline, and rank.
 - 1.2 Mitigate bias in the selection process.
 - 1.3 Broaden the volunteer and candidate pools.
 - 1.4 Be transparent about compensation for Senate service, and advocate for compensation for Senate service where possible.
 - 1.5 Reward and document service.
- 2. Create resources to support Senate committees and chairs to engage in DEI work.
 - 2.1 Require implicit bias training for faculty serving in the Senate.
 - 2.2 Require implicit bias training for Senate staff.
 - 2.3 Establish norms of engagement in Senate meetings and work, and mechanisms to encourage adherence to these norms.
 - 2.4 Appoint strategic advisers to Senate Leadership, Senate committee chairs, and Senate committees.
- 3. Publicize the Senate's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- 4. Hold units accountable for improving climate.
- 5. Ensure that faculty have the support they need to succeed at UCLA.
- 6. Implement practices for mitigating implicit bias.

Acknowledgments

This report was undertaken in 2020–21 by Dr. Aileen Liu as a participant in the UCLA Professional Development Program (PDP).² The report was sponsored by Professors Shane White, Jody Kreiman, and Michael Meranze—Senate Leadership in 2020–21—and Senate Executive Director Dr. April de Stefano.

Introduction

When this report was initiated in September 2020, UCLA was—and still is—in the throes of several crises: the COVID-19 pandemic and the campus' rapid transition to remote learning and operations; the

¹ This report refers to diversity, equity, and inclusion as "DEI" in order to distinguish the concept from the UCLA Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, also referred to as "the EDI Office."

² "PDP was launched in 1994 to provide the University with highly trained and qualified staff prepared to move into leadership positions. This one-year leadership development program provides participants in PSS 2-6 classifications with opportunities to enhance professional and management skills, build professional networks, and learn about the structure and culture of the University." A major program component is a "Capstone Project – Participants will complete an individual project that improves a process, solves a problem, or otherwise provides a benefit to their department" (https://www.chr.ucla.edu/training-and-development/professional-development-program-pdp).

pandemic's immediate and anticipated impact on the campus budget, including a pause in faculty hiring; and several high-profile incidents of anti-black racism and violence in the United States in spring 2020, in particular the killings of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and Ahmaud Arbery. These incidents ignited public attention to systemic racism—already thrown into sharp relief by the unequal impacts of the pandemic—and led to protests and demonstrations in Los Angeles and across the globe that called for racial justice.

As protests were gathering steam in the week following Memorial Day, several UCLA units—including the Anderson School of Management, the David Geffen School of Medicine (DGSOM), the School of Law, the Samueli School of Engineering, the School of Dentistry, the School of Nursing, the Division of Physical Sciences, the Library, and the Staff Assembly—published statements of support.³ On May 30, 2020, a memo titled "The Pain Behind the Protests" was sent to the UCLA community, signed by 37 senior leaders, including the UCLA Academic Senate Chair. The memo reaffirmed UCLA's belief that

Equity, respect and justice are central to the character of our institution, to the health of our democracy and to the well-being of our world. Still, we recognize that UCLA also can and must do better. As campus leaders, we recommit ourselves to ensuring that our policies and actions value the lives, safety and dignity of every Bruin.⁴

UC offices also sent statements of support. On May 31, 2020, UC President Janet Napolitano and UC Board of Regents Chair John A. Pérez sent a statement to the UC community, which urged us all to "examine our own biases and find a way to eliminate the systemic racial inequities that pervade our country in order to effect real and lasting change."⁵ And on June 3, 2020, the Academic Council of the UC Academic Senate—a body that includes the UCLA Academic Senate Chair—published a memo titled "A Moment of Silence and Reflection" that stated, "On all UC campuses, we must listen and, crucially, do more to combat systemic oppression, including anti-black racism."

Two themes emerge from these statements: an assertion of institutional commitment to DEI, and a call to action and change on individual and institutional levels—to "do more" and to "do better." Since that watershed moment in the days and weeks after Memorial Day 2020, the question has been: What are you and your institutions doing to do more, and better? This report seeks to support current and future Senate Leadership in answering that question.

The report had three primary goals: (1) to understand how the Senate currently promotes DEI; (2) to understand existing challenges, barriers, and gaps in that work; and (3) to develop recommendations and best practices to improve the Senate's ability to promote DEI.

Methodology

The methodology for this report was to solicit input from UCLA Senate faculty about their experiences and perceptions of the Senate; to gather information from previous studies of DEI issues at UCLA and

³ These statements are linked on the Office of EDI's "Resources for Racial Trauma" webpage: <u>https://equity.ucla.edu/know/resources-for-racial-trauma</u>

 ⁴ "The Pain Behind the Protests" (May 30, 2020) <u>https://chancellor.ucla.edu/messages/pain-behind-protests</u>
⁵ "UC statement of protests, violence following George Floyd's death" (May 31, 2020)
<u>https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/press-room/uc-statement-protests-violence-following-george-floyd-s-death</u>

the University of California; and to gather information and best practices from implicit bias trainings as well as research about the efficacy of such trainings.

From September 2020 to March 2021, Liu conducted one-on-one interviews with 38 Senate faculty (<u>Appendix 1</u>). Liu also reviewed nine task force and committee reports related to DEI at UCLA and the UC published in the last decade as well as peer-reviewed research about implicit bias trainings (<u>Appendix 2</u>), and participated in three implicit bias trainings offered at UCLA and UC (<u>Appendix 3</u>). This report addresses themes raised in these interviews, studies, and trainings.

Findings

A total of 38 Senate faculty were interviewed for this report, with at least one faculty member from almost every Division in the College and almost every professional School.⁶ The majority of the Senate faculty interviewed are faculty of color. The majority are full professors; the rest are emeriti, associate, and assistant professors. Most have served on Senate committees, and several have served in senior administrative positions, Senate leadership positions, or both. (See <u>Appendix 1</u>.)

From these one-on-one interviews with Senate faculty, the following themes emerged about perceptions of Senate committee representation and how the Senate currently promotes DEI:

- 1. Faculty perceive that the Senate does not represent their constituencies and needs, and perceive that faculty who serve on Senate committees and as Senate Leadership are not representative of the diversity of Senate faculty at UCLA along the lines of gender, race and ethnicity, and discipline.
 - a. Notably, there was a lack of consensus among faculty interviewed about which groups were underrepresented and why. This lack of consensus suggests an opportunity for the Senate to conduct an analysis of its committee demographics.
- 2. Faculty perceive that the Senate does not consistently act to promote DEI, and at times has acted in opposition to these values.
 - a. For example, several faculty described the Senate as a body that protects faculty in misconduct cases. Other faculty described a perceived conflict in values between the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CODEI) and the Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF). These perceptions suggest an opportunity for the Senate to consider how it communicates its mission and work to the broader UCLA community.
- 3. Faculty perceive that the Senate has authority over curriculum, program review, and student admissions, and influence over faculty review and faculty hiring. However, faculty perceive program review as lacking teeth when it comes to holding academic and administrative units accountable for improving climate and DEI. Faculty also perceive CODEI to be powerless to effect real change when it comes to policies to advance faculty diversity through recruitment, advancement, and retention.
 - a. For example, one faculty member noted that, although CODEI's bylaws specify that the Committee "advises the Chancellor on proposals for waivers of search for academic appointments of 'targets of opportunity,'" their advisory role is inconsistent at best.

⁶ Not represented among the 38 Senate faculty interviewed: Division of Physical Sciences, School of the Arts and Architecture, and School of Nursing.

These perceptions suggest an opportunity for the Senate to consider existing and new opportunities to leverage its direct authority and influence.

4. Faculty perceive Senate committee service as "exclusive" and "by invitation only." Some faculty are seen as "lifers" who cycle from one Senate committee to the next. Some faculty who are interested in serving are never invited and do not know why.

One faculty member described serving on a Senate committee as eye-opening, with committee meetings as "overwhelmingly white" spaces. Another faculty member described witnessing microaggressions—""Did I just hear that? moments"—that seemed to go unacknowledged and unaddressed. One faculty member said, "I was disappointed to not see the Senate send a strong message and take a stand [in the wake of the 2020 racial justice protests]. If they have, I haven't seen it. I've heard more from administration about commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion. Faculty have to own this problem as our problem, and be committed to working with administration to be part of creating solutions."

From the interviews with 38 Senate faculty and studies of DEI issues at UCLA and the University of California, the following themes emerged about institutional and structural barriers for the Senate to promote DEI and to diversify Senate committees and Senate Leadership. Notably, several of these issues have been further exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on faculty productivity, advancement, morale, work-life balance, and dependent care responsibilities:⁷

- 1. Too few women and people of color are hired into Senate faculty positions, tenured, promoted to full, and retained.⁸
- 2. Female faculty and faculty of color are disproportionately burdened by service work, both formal (e.g. committee work) and informal (e.g. mentorship,⁹ extra office hours, service to communities beyond the campus, "diversity work").¹⁰
- 3. Service is not adequately recognized or valued in the tenure, merit, and promotion process.
 - a. Some faculty attributed this challenge to narrow definitions of achievement and excellence, and what kinds of contributions are valued.
 - b. Some faculty described service, especially mentorship, as gendered and racialized "domestic labor" and "invisible work."
 - c. Many faculty identified, as a recent "win," the added requirement of a "Diversity Statement" for regular rank faculty candidates and ladder rank faculty promotions.¹¹

⁷ "Mitigating COVID-19 Impacts on Faculty."

⁸ Several faculty members noted that individuals that hold non-Senate titles—e.g. adjunct professors, lecturers without security of employment (see <u>Appendix 4</u>)—are more likely to be women, people of color, and from low-income communities. Individuals in these non-Senate titles also carry out a large share of the university's teaching mission. These faculty members suggested reconsidering which titles are part of Senate membership, as a way to immediately increase the diversity of the pool of Senate faculty eligible to serve on Senate committees, and to ensure that these populations have a seat at the table. Notably, a 2010 UC Task Force on Senate Membership chose not to "recommend transfer of existing non-Senate titles to Senate membership nor the creation of new Senate titles," but did recommend "a review of faculty in the Health Sciences and transfer of faculty to the appropriate titles based upon the expectations of their positions and actual duties" ("Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership").

⁹ In 2018, the UCLA Mentoring and Evaluation of Graduate Academic Progress (MEGAP) Workgroup recommended that "the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) and the Academic Personnel Office (APO) [be encouraged] to integrate mentoring into the promotion and review of faculty" ("MEGAP Workgroup Report").

¹⁰ "UCLA Faculty Service Report."

¹¹ <u>https://equity.ucla.edu/news-and-events/new-edi-statement-requirement-for-regular-rank-faculty-searches</u>

4. The workload of certain types of Senate service (e.g. members of committees that meet every other week, specific committee chairs) is especially burdensome and uncompensated, which may be a barrier for equitable faculty participation.¹²

Multiple faculty described the way that faculty from marginalized groups are further marginalized by structures, policies, and practices at UCLA. One faculty member said, "Changing these structures is not an act of charity. It will help everyone." However, several faculty members described "diversity work" within the Senate and at UCLA more broadly as an "uphill battle." As one faculty member put it, "[Diversity work] is pushing a Mack truck up a hill by yourself." Another faculty member said, "[Diversity work] is important, but you have to be crazy to do it." One faculty member who chaired a Senate committee said that working to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion through the committee "was a tremendous amount of work, difficult work, that no one cared about and no one recognized" when it came to their promotion case.

These findings informed the following principles for this report's recommendations:

- 1. DEI must be understood as a shared responsibility of all faculty and all Senate committees, not only CODEI, and not only faculty from marginalized groups.
 - a. One study indicated that women and people of color who engage in diversity-valuing behavior—defined as "behavior as that which promotes demographic balance within organizations"—"are penalized in terms of how others perceive their competence and effectiveness." White or male leaders are not penalized for engaging in diversity-valuing behavior, nor are they rewarded.¹³
- 2. Coalition-building is important, but it is not enough to get the "right people" to serve. For DEI to be a shared responsibility at the Senate, there must be structural change and support in the form of resources and accountability. The Senate should examine its structures, practices, policies, and norms to understand how they may promote inequality and replicate biases, and introduce changes.
 - Several faculty spoke positively about the Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion's seven-part video series on implicit bias, required for service on faculty search committees.
- 3. Initiatives to diversify Senate committees and Senate Leadership must go hand-in-hand with initiatives to properly value and compensate service, mitigate institutional barriers for female faculty and faculty of color, and improve climate at the Senate and at UCLA—all of which are within the Senate's authority and influence.

Finally, one additional theme that emerged from faculty interviews was how faculty choose to devote their time and energy at different stages of their faculty careers, and how they approach the question of how they want to make an impact. One faculty member explained, "We choose to serve the community insofar as we care about that community. Faculty who serve have a sense of community, feel connected

¹² The 2010 UC Task Force on Senate Membership identified "equitable participation in Senate deliberations" as an area of concern: "We were concerned that the combination of continued budget cuts with increases in classroom size and instructional demands across the faculty may render some segments of the University, e.g., those unable to obtain release time or funding, unable to participate fully in shared governance. This issue will need to be monitored by the systemwide Academic Senate and steps taken to address workload issues that may severely limit faculty participation in service activities" ("Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership").

¹³ Hekman et al (2016).

to the larger community, care for it and value it." The following two comments are illustrative of this point: One faculty member, when asked why she has served on Senate and systemwide committees for 20+ years, said, "UCLA took me in. Everything good in my life is from UCLA." Another faculty member, when asked why she directs much of her service work toward supporting communities outside of campus, said, "Higher education has not been welcoming to me [as a woman of color]. So why would I be invested in institution-building?" The question of how faculty make choices around the question of impact at different stages of their career—and how the Senate can better position itself as an option for faculty seeking to make an impact—are beyond the scope of this report, and may be worth pursuing.

Recommendations

1 Increase diversity of Senate committees and Senate Leadership.

All Senate committees and Senate Leadership should be diverse along the lines of gender, race and ethnicity, and discipline. Given their responsibilities, the following should be prioritized: Senate Leadership, committee chairs, Council on Academic Personnel (CAP), Committee on Committees (ConC), Committee on Charges (Charges), Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T), Graduate Council (GC), and Undergraduate Council (UgC).

1.1 Publish and conduct periodic analyses of Senate committee demographics by gender, race and ethnicity, discipline, and rank.

- Publishing committee demographics data on the Senate website will foster transparency and accountability.¹⁴
- Conducting routine analyses will allow the Senate to understand trends over time and take proactive steps to address imbalances.

1.2 Mitigate bias in the selection process.

- Articulate objective criteria for ranking and selecting nominees to Senate committees, in order to reduce bias and arbitrary, capricious judgments.
- Reconsider the long-standing campus practice of expecting that CAP members be Full Professor, Step VI or higher. Faculty Salary Equity Studies show that disparities increase as faculty ranks increase; this practice replicates and compounds existing disparities with respect to groups based on gender and/or race and ethnicity.¹⁵

1.3 Broaden the volunteer and candidate pools.

• Target faculty to encourage them to volunteer for Senate committees or run for elected Senate positions (e.g., Senate Vice Chair and ConC membership). One group of faculty to consider

¹⁴ The Senate would need to create infrastructure to publish these data in a more automated way, akin to the Office of EDI's Senate Faculty Workforce Diversity (no DGSOM) Dashboard (<u>https://equity.ucla.edu/data-hub/senate-faculty-diversity</u>) and the recently launched David Geffen School of Medicine Dashboards

^{(&}lt;u>https://tableau.uclanet.ucla.edu/t/apb/views/ARRDashboard/Faculty-Gender</u>), which show the diversity of DGSOM faculty, staff and trainees.

¹⁵ "Salary Equity Study Recommendations."

targeting is alumni of the Office of Faculty Development's Faculty Leadership Development Program.¹⁶

- Ask current and former Senate committee members and Leadership to present about their experiences with Senate service at department meetings and encourage their colleagues to volunteer.
- Share professional accomplishments of current and former Senate committee members and Leadership on the Senate website and social media, to demonstrate that Senate service attracts top faculty and is a leadership development opportunity.

1.4 Be transparent about compensation for Senate service, and advocate for compensation for Senate service where possible.

- Be transparent about compensation when nominating faculty to Senate positions that receive compensation in the form of stipends, research funds, summer ninths, and/or course releases.
- Periodically review which Senate positions receive compensation for above-and-beyond service, through the lens of equity. For example, given how central DEI is on campus and the workload carried by the CODEI Chair, consider whether that position should receive compensation.
- Be transparent about the process for requesting compensation for above-and-beyond Senate service.
- Encourage department chairs and deans to compensate their faculty's Senate committee service, e.g. through course releases or sabbatical credits.
- Continue to advocate, at the systemwide and campus levels, for compensation for key Senate positions.

1.5 Reward and document service.

- Improve documentation of what Senate committee members and chairs have done and accomplished, to provide promotion committees with a better sense of the scope and impact of the faculty member's service. Include quantitative and qualitative evidence.
- Reward service in promotion and advancement. For example, take into consideration Senate committee service for promotion to Step VI.
- Encourage departments and Deans to reward service in promotion and advancement.

2 Create resources to support Senate committees and chairs to engage in DEI work.

Formal structures and resources can help to ensure that "diversity work" does not continue to default to faculty of color and female faculty who serve on Senate committees, or the Chair of CODEI, which is

¹⁶ The UCLA Faculty Leadership Development Program was initiated in Fall 2017 on EVCP Scott Waugh's request. EVCP Waugh envisioned that the program would provide "associate professors, who have interest in leadership positions, with insight into the structure, funding and governance of UCLA," and "broaden opportunities for participation in academic leadership for women and members of minority groups." As of 2020, the program consists of five components: (1) a one-day Introduction to Leadership Workshop for 25–30 advanced Associate and early full Professors with service inclinations; (2) a six-month Faculty Leadership Academy for 15–20 faculty who have completed the Workshop; (3) a six-part New and Continuing Chairs Training for cohorts of 25 new and continuing department chairs; (4) a seven-part Senior Administrative Leadership Onboarding (SALO) program for new Deans, Vice Chancellors, and Vice Provosts; and (5) special workshops and consultations for faculty leaders, including department chairs and directors, on specific issues including civility and misconduct (https://www.apo.ucla.edu/faculty-resources/career-development).

currently an uncompensated Senate position. In addition to easing the burden on underrepresented groups, formal structures and resources send the message that DEI is a Senate-wide responsibility.

2.1 Require implicit bias training for faculty serving in the Senate.

Provide education for faculty on recognizing and addressing bias, including gender and racial bias and implicit bias. Given their responsibilities, the following should be prioritized: Senate Leadership, committee chairs, CAP and ClinCAP,¹⁷ ConC, Charges, P&T, Grievance Advisory Committee (GAC), GC, and UgC.

- Provide UC/CSU Moving Beyond Bias in-person workshops, led and facilitated by faculty who have been trained as trainers, or better yet, current and former Senate committee chairs and Leadership after they have been trained as trainers; or
- Provide the Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI)'s online seven-part video series on implicit bias, ~30 minutes total. Consider augmenting the video series with a set of reflection questions tailored to Senate committee service.
- Allow faculty to opt out of training if they have completed implicit bias training through the EDI Office to serve on a faculty search committee within X number of years (e.g. three).

2.2 Require implicit bias training for Senate staff.

Senate staff can and do influence Senate committees' practices, procedures, and norms. Staff provide institutional continuity for Senate committees and Senate Leadership, which turn over every year. Staff are positioned to socialize committee chairs and members in behavioral norms and practices that can perpetuate the status quo, or promote and sustain the cultural change we wish to see.

- Provide UC/CSU Moving Beyond Bias in-person workshops, led and facilitated by faculty who have been trained as a trainers; or
- Provide a customized workshop designed and led by a faculty member or equity advisor;¹⁸ or
- Provide the UC online six-part implicit bias modules for employees, 20–30 minutes each. Consider augmenting the modules with a set of reflection questions tailored to Senate work, and/or facilitated conversations with all staff.
- Empower and train staff to speak up, ask questions, and advise committee chairs to ensure that attention is paid to issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion.
- Empower and train staff to recognize and interrupt—or prompt committee chairs to interrupt attitudes and practices rooted in bias (e.g. microaggressions).

¹⁷ This recommendation echoes the UC Academic Council's recommendation that campuses "provide and require anti-bias training for all members of promotion committees, from the department level on up" ("Mitigating," p. 5).

¹⁸ Due to their research expertise, some faculty have already been called on to design and lead trainings for other campus units. For example, Ben Refuerzo (Professor of Architecture and Urban Design) led a session at a Division of Undergraduate Education retreat in 2020; and Mitchell Chang (Professor of Education and of Asian American Studies) and Tyrone Howard (Professor of Education) have been working with Athletics' anti-racism committee in 2020–21 to develop workshops for coaches and student athletes.

2.3 Establish norms of engagement in Senate meetings and work, and mechanisms to encourage adherence to these norms.

- Establish norms for interactions and behavior, including in Senate meetings and committee work. Norms could address inappropriate comments or behaviors rooted in bias (e.g. microaggressions). Norms could also include clear warnings against interruptions.
- Provide training for faculty and staff, particularly Senate committee chairs and Senate Leadership, on skills for conflict management, confronting bias, and constructive dialogue.
- Support Senate committee chairs to counsel members who violate norms. Create processes to remove members for persistent failure or inability to follow norms.
- Consider behavior that violates norms when appointing faculty to committees.

2.4 Appoint strategic advisers to Senate Leadership, Senate committee chairs, and Senate committees.

- Appoint a faculty member to act as a strategic adviser to Senate Leadership, Senate committee chairs, and Senate committees. This adviser would provide guidance for promoting and sustaining diversity, equity, and inclusion in all aspects of the Senate's work, akin to the work done by Faculty Equity Advisors in departments and academic units on campus.¹⁹ The position should receive compensation. The position could be appointed for a multi-year term to ensure institutional continuity, and could serve as an *ex officio* member of CODEI. The faculty member appointed to this position should be someone with Senate experience and credibility.
- Support CODEI in reimagining its charge, including how CODEI supports diversity, equity, and inclusion on campus, and how CODEI could act as an advisory body to other Senate committees on issues related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

3 Publicize the Senate's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

The Senate, particularly via the actions of Senate Leadership, should consistently and publicly demonstrate commitment to promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion. Demonstrating the Senate's commitment is culture informing, and provides examples for Senate committees and others to extrapolate from.

- Clarify the Senate's mission and goals vis-à-vis diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- In addition to articulating present commitment to DEI, understand, grapple with, document, and acknowledge past failures in this work.²⁰

¹⁹ "In June 2014, all schools and academic units were asked to appoint an Equity Advisor, who would take leadership on matters of equity, diversity, and inclusion within their institution. Distributed throughout the University, these Equity Advisors leverage their direct experience with local culture and climate to advise their deans in terms of strategy, policy, training, climate, and accountability. Roles and responsibilities vary; however, many Equity Advisors play an important role in faculty training, monitoring the faculty search and other hiring processes, improving climate, and consulting on matters of equity, diversity, and inclusion. Although Equity Advisors report directly to their deans, they also work closely with and provide invaluable advice to the Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion. They constitute the most important advisory council for the Office" (https://equity.ucla.edu/about-us/our-teams/equity-advisors).

²⁰ Multiple faculty members identified, as an example of historical failures of the Senate, the resistance and challenges leading up to the passage of the Diversity Requirement in 2014–15. As one faculty member described, UCLA was the only UC campus at that time—with the exception of the newest campus, UC Merced—to *not* have a diversity requirement. Another faculty member identified the 1993 hunger strike following Chancellor Charles E. Young's announcement that the Chicano Studies Program would not receive departmental status (<u>https://oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/kt0b69p9s1</u>).

- Publish DEI Award and Distinguished Teaching Award recipients' profiles and personal statements on the Senate website and social media.
- Continue to make DEI a priority for every Senate committee, and not "only" CODEI.
- Add to Senate committees' annual reports a section on contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- Highlight Senate accomplishments that promote DEI on the Senate website and social media. These accomplishments could be pulled from committees' annual reports.
- Publish Senate committees' annual reports on the Senate website, to enhance transparency and accountability.

4 Hold units accountable for improving climate.

To hold the campus accountable for improving climate and promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion, the Senate must improve collaboration and communication with academic units and administration. Accountability is crucial for program review, where the Senate has direct authority through GC and UgC; and for faculty review and faculty hiring, where the Senate has influence through CAP, ClinCAP, Charges, and P&T, and more indirect influence through program review reports and recommendations.

- Hold academic units accountable for improving climate and DEI through the program review process. Collaborate with the EVC/P and the EDI Office to assess progress and impose timely consequences (e.g. suspension of faculty hiring, suspension of graduate admissions) for persistent failure or inability to address issues.
- Advocate for campus mechanisms to address significant climate concerns in academic units when they're identified by the program review process. Collaborate with campus administration (e.g. the EVC/P, the EDI Office, the Academic Personnel Office) to ensure that these mechanisms are in place and effective.
- Educate program review team members about potential recommendations and resources to help units improve climate and DEI. Encourage review teams to use CODEI's issue statements to identify issues as well as potential recommendations and resources. Encourage review team members to interview students and junior faculty and to spotlight their voices in the review team report, to identify specific climate issues and provide guidance.

5 Ensure that faculty have the support they need to succeed at UCLA.

- Attend department, Chairs, and/or FEC meetings to educate faculty about what the Senate is, what it does, and how it can support faculty.
- Promote the Grievance Advisory Committee (GAC) as a resource for individual faculty.²¹
- Educate department chairs and Deans about the reality and impact of unequal service burdens, and the disparate impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on faculty.²² Partner with the Academic

²¹ GAC's charge: "GAC faculty members are available on an individual basis to explain grievance procedures and what constitutes faculty rights and privileges. ...The Committee assists faculty, staff, and students in discerning whether their matter is a grievance or charge and with choosing the appropriate route for a formal complaint or grievance. ... Unless they involve an incident that requires mandatory reporting (such as violence, danger to self or others, or sexual harassment/violence) all queries and consultations are treated as confidential."

²² This recommendation echoes the UC Academic Council's recommendation that campuses "Establish a culture of awareness of the disparate impacts of the COVID-era on career success across the academic and university spectrum, including impacts on

Personnel Office and the Office of Faculty Development to co-facilitate workshops for department chairs, directors, and faculty.

• Advocate for increased resources for faculty mentorship, professional development, and support, particularly for junior faculty, female faculty, and faculty of color (e.g. through the Council of Advisers and the Office of Faculty Development).

6 Implement practices for mitigating implicit bias.

Studies show that stress, fatigue, and distraction can trigger implicit bias. Implement practices that reduce situational triggers: give time to pause, reduce fatigue, reduce stress, and reduce distraction.²³ These practices should be implemented throughout the Senate's work, including but not limited to Senate committee meetings, Leadership meetings, staff meetings, and program review site visit meetings.

- Discuss trickiest items first during meetings, when people are less fatigued and distracted.
- Schedule meetings earlier in the day. Do not schedule meetings at lunch time or at the end of the day.
- Schedule shorter meetings: 45 minutes instead of 1 hour; 90 minutes instead of 2 hours.
- Schedule breaks during longer meetings.

faculty, students, postdocs/trainees, and staff. This cultural shift should emanate from top leadership, beginning at the Office of the President and the Chair of the Academic Senate" ("Mitigating," p. 5).

²³ Devine et al (2012). These practices are taught in the UC/CSU "Moving Beyond Bias" workshops.

Appendix 1: List of Interviews

A total of 38 Senate faculty members were interviewed, including 3 of 3 of current Senate Leadership (2020–21). Each interview was conducted by Aileen Liu, and lasted 30–60 minutes.

The table below lists all Senate faculty who were interviewed for this report, including their titles and affiliations.

Name	Title	Affiliation
Senate Leadership		
Shane White	Professor; Senate Chair, 2020–21	Dentistry
Jody Kreiman	Professor In-Residence; Senate Vice Chair/Chair- Elect, 2020–21	Linguistics; Head & Neck Surgery
Michael Meranze	Professor; Senate Immediate Past Chair, 2020–21	History
Senate Faculty		
Leisy Abrego	Professor	Chicana/o and Central American Studies
Randall Akee	Associate Professor	Public Policy; American Indian Studies
Rosina Becerra	Professor Emerita	Social Welfare
Ali Behdad	Professor	English
Corinne Bendersky	Professor	Law
James Bisley	Professor	Neurobiology; Psychology
Scott Brandenberg	Professor	Civil and Environmental Engineering
Joe Bristow	Professor; Senate Chair,	English
	2018–19	
Alex Bui	Professor	Radiological Sciences
Genevieve Carpio	Assistant Professor	Chicana/o and Central American Studies
Jessica Cattelino	Associate Professor	Anthropology
Mitchell Chang	Professor	Education; Asian American Studies
King-Kok Cheung	Professor	English; Asian American Studies
Chris Colwell	Professor	Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences
Chris Dunkel Schetter	Professor; Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Development	Psychology; Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences
Mishuana Goeman	Professor	Gender Studies; American Indian Studies
Carole Goldberg	Professor Emerita; Senate Chair, 1993–94	Law
Daniel Kamei	Professor	Bioengineering
Cheryl Keyes	Professor	Ethnomusicology and Global Jazz Studies; African American Studies

Table 1

Rajesh Kumar	Professor In-Residence	Anesthesiology; Radiological Sciences; Bioengineering
Marissa Lopez	Associate Professor	English; Chicana/o and Central American Studies
William Marotti	Associate Professor	History, East Asian Studies
Chon Noriega	Professor	Film, Television, and Digital Media
Rafael Perez-Torres	Professor	English; Gender Studies; Chicana/o and Central American Studies
Nader Pouratian	Professor	Neurosurgery
Srinivasa Reddy	Professor In-Residence	Medicine, Obstetrics and Gynecology; Molecular and Medical Pharmacology
Ellen Scott	Associate Professor	Film and TV
Jenny Sharpe	Professor; Associate Dean of Diversity, Division of Humanities	English; Gender Studies; Comparative Literature
Margaret Shih	Professor; Associate Vice Chancellor, BruinX	Management
Ertugrul (ET) Taciroglu	Professor	Civil and Environmental Engineering
Belinda Tucker	Professor Emerita	Psychiatry & Biobehavioral Sciences
Miguel Unzueta	Professor	Management
Arturo Vargas Bustamante	Associate Professor	Health Policy and Management
Richard Yarborough	Professor	African American Studies; English
Kie Zuraw	Professor	Linguistics

In addition to faculty interviews, the following individuals were consulted:

- Kyndra Cleveland, Research Scientist, UCLA Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
- Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director, UC Riverside Academic Senate
- April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate
- Johnathan Perkins, Special Assistant to the UCLA Vice Chancellor of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
- Letty Trevino, UCLA Graduate Student Association (GSA) Vice President for Academic Affairs

Appendix 2: Bibliography

Items are ordered chronologically.

Moreno Recommendations Implementation Committee (MRIC), "MRIC Final Report" (January 4, 2021) The Moreno Recommendations Implementation Committee (MRIC) was created to monitor and assess UCLA's activities, progress, and challenges regarding implementation of the Moreno Committee recommendations. MRIC provided detailed information to assist the Chancellor, the EVC/P, Senior Leadership and the wider community develop a comprehensive approach to faculty equity, diversity and inclusion at UCLA. The MRIC Report documents areas of success and challenge, offers ideas for consideration, evidence of "Promising Practices and Initiatives," and recommendations for continued progress towards achieving Inclusive Excellence at UCLA. Our recommendations are based on analysis of the University faculty landscape, institutional practices, and the narratives of Black and Latina Faculty. UC Academic Council, "Mitigating COVID-19 Impacts on Faculty" (January 26, 2021)

https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/ files/reports/mg-md-mitigating-covid-impacts-on-faculty.pdf Recommendations for mitigating COVID-19 impacts on faculty advancement, morale, work-life balance, and dependent care responsibilities. The recommendations outline both immediate actions the University can take to support faculty, and also longer-term systemic changes to better support equity, inclusion, recruitment, and retention.

UCLA Faculty Service Ad Hoc Task Force, "UCLA Faculty Service Report" (Fall 2020) This report provides some solutions to the problem of inequity in service among faculty and develops strategies to reward or compensate those doing more.

Chang, Edward H., Milkman, Katherine L., Gromet, Dena M., Rebele, Robert W., Massey, Cade, Duckworth, Angela L., and Grant, Adam M. (2019). "The mixed effects of online diversity training." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116 (16), 7778-7783.

https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1816076116

Although diversity training is commonplace in organizations, the relative scarcity of field experiments testing its effectiveness leaves ambiguity about whether diversity training improves attitudes and behaviors toward women and racial minorities. We present results from a large (n = 3,016) field experiment at a global organization testing whether a brief science-based online diversity training can change attitudes and behaviors toward women in the workplace. Our preregistered field experiment included an active placebo control and measured participants' attitudes and real workplace decisions up to 20 weeks postintervention. Among groups whose average untreated attitudes—whereas still supportive of women—were relatively less supportive of women than other groups, our diversity training successfully produced attitude change but not behavior change. On the other hand, our diversity training successfully generated some behavior change among groups whose average untreated attitudes were already strongly supportive of women before training. This paper extends our knowledge about the pathways to attitude and behavior change in the context of bias reduction. However, the results suggest that the one-off diversity trainings that are commonplace in organizations are unlikely to be standalone solutions for promoting equality in the workplace, particularly given their limited efficacy among those groups whose behaviors policymakers are most eager to influence.

MEGAP Workgroup, "Mentoring and Evaluation of Graduate Academic Progress (MEGAP) Workgroup Report to Graduate Council" (October 12, 2018; corrected May 3, 2019)

In 2016-2017, the Mentoring and Evaluation of Graduate Academic Progress (MEGAP) workgroup was co-charged by the UCLA Graduate Council and UCLA Graduate Division to address the evaluation of graduate student academic progress and the role of mentoring in enhancing student experiences and success. MEGAP's charge was to develop recommendations, best practices, and tools that departments can use to apply the principles articulated in the UCLA Graduate Student Academic Rights and Responsibilities statement.

Joint Senate-Administration Faculty Salary Equity Committee, "Senate Faculty Salary Equity Study and Recommendations" (February 2016, February 22, 2017) <u>https://www.apo.ucla.edu/compensation/ucla-faculty-salary-equity-studies</u>

This study focused on analyzing salary data as of July 1, 2013, by gender and race/ethnicity; equity adjustments since that time are not reflected in the report.

Hekman, David R., Johnson, Stefanie K., Foo, Maw-Der, and Yang, Wei. (2016). "Does Diversity-Valuing Behavior Result in Diminished Performance Ratings for Non-White and Female Leaders?" Academy of Management Journal, 60(2). https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.0538

We seek to help solve the puzzle of why top-level leaders are disproportionately White men. We suggest that this race- and sex-based status and power gap persists, in part, because ethnic minority and female leaders are discouraged from engaging in diversity-valuing behavior. We hypothesize, and test in both field and laboratory samples, that ethnic minority or female leaders who engage in diversity-valuing behavior are penalized with worse performance ratings, whereas White or male leaders who engage in diversity-valuing behavior are penalized with worse performance ratings, stereotypes (i.e., lower competence judgments) placed upon diversity-valuing ethnic minority and female leaders. We discuss how our findings extend and enrich the vast literatures on the glass ceiling, tokenism, and workplace discrimination.

Oscar J. Mayorga and Susan Drange Lee, "Report on the Academic Senate's Departmental Program Review Process and its Influence on Diversity-Related Departmental Issues" (July 15, 2015)

This report addresses themes in diversity-related issues raised in department program review reports from 2008-09 through 2012-13 and the effectiveness of the review process as a vehicle for impacting equity, diversity and inclusion at the departmental level.

Mitchell Chang, "Addendum to Report on the Efficacy of Departmental Reviews for Assessing Diversity" (August 3, 2015)

Moreno Committee, "Independent Investigative Report on Acts of Bias and Discrimination Involving Faculty at the University of California, Los Angeles (Moreno Report)" (October 15, 2013) https://evcp.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/UCLA-External-Review-Team-Report-FINAL.pdf

This report is the culmination of several months of investigation regarding the university's policies, procedures, and mechanisms for responding to incidents of perceived bias, discrimination, and intolerance at UCLA involving faculty of color—including in hiring and advancement decisions. We conclude that UCLA's policies and procedures for responding to incidents of perceived bias, discrimination and intolerance involving faculty are inadequate. The university administration must work to find solutions to this problem.

Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Austin, A. J., & Cox, W. T. L. (2012). "Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(6), 1267–1278. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.06.003</u>

We developed a multi-faceted prejudice habit-breaking intervention to produce long-term reductions in implicit race bias. The intervention is based on the premise that implicit bias is like a habit that can be broken through a combination of awareness of implicit bias, concern about the effects of that bias, and the application of strategies to reduce bias. In a 12-week longitudinal study, people who received the intervention showed dramatic reductions in implicit race bias. People who were concerned about discrimination or who reported using the strategies showed the greatest reductions. The intervention also led to increases in concern about discrimination and personal awareness of bias over the duration of the study. People in the control group showed none of the above effects. Our results raise the hope of reducing persistent and unintentional forms of discrimination that arise from implicit bias. UC Task Force on Senate Membership, "Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership" (April 15, 2010)

https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/underreview/SenMembershipTFReport.pdf

The Task Force was charged to review Senate membership by delineating historical criteria used to define Senate membership, deriving of a set of principles underlying Senate membership, and making recommendations, if warranted, for modification of Senate membership.

Appendix 3: UCLA and UC Implicit Bias Trainings

UC/CSU Moving Beyond Bias https://movingbeyondbias.org

Moving Beyond Bias is a learning program that explores how bias works, and how we can reduce its harmful effects on CSU and UC campuses. Participants:

- Examine personal biases and learn how they can influence behavior and decisionmaking in academic contexts
- See the connection between social group biases (whether positive or negative) and their potential impact on university policies, procedures and outcomes
- Are introduced to strategies to equip participants to both recognize and disrupt attitudes and practices that are rooted in bias
- Practice the mindful use of tools and strategies to disrupt bias

The 2018 California Budget Act included a one-time appropriation of \$1.2 million for a two-year pilot program "to provide anti-bias training for administrators, faculty, staff, and student leaders at campuses of the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU)." A joint UC-CSU workgroup of content experts was formed — including scholars and practitioners of antibias and implicit bias training — to define the scope and learning outcomes of an evidence-based program appropriate for different university populations. This workgroup issued a Request for Proposals (RFP), inviting vendors to demonstrate their training modules and address questions. In June 2019, after a comprehensive review of all proposals, the UC-CSU workgroup selected Just Communities of Central Coast and Dr. Carmel Saad to deliver the pilot training program. This training is modeled after Dr. Patricia Devine's Breaking the Bias Habit framework, which approaches bias as a natural thought-habit that can be disrupted with awareness, concern and practice.

UCLA Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion's Seven-Part Video Series on Implicit Bias for Faculty Search Committees <u>https://equity.ucla.edu/programs-resources/faculty-search-process/faculty-search-proc</u>

Since 2016, faculty search briefings have had two primary components: (1) a seven-part animated video series on implicit bias (roughly 30 minutes total, to be viewed on your own time before the briefing); (2) an in-class training that explores evidence-based tools and techniques to promote equitable and inclusive hiring.

- 1. Preface: Biases and Heuristics (5:13)
- 2. Lesson 1: Schemas (3:12)
- 3. Lesson 2: Attitudes and Stereotypes (4:13)
- 4. Lesson 3: Real World Consequences (3:45)
- 5. Lesson 4: Explicit v. Implicit Bias (2:49)

- 6. Lesson 5: The IAT (5:14)
- 7. Lesson 6: Countermeasures (5:23)

UC Implicit Bias Modules for UC Employees <u>https://equity.ucla.edu/know/implicit-bias</u> Modules (20-30 minutes each) are hosted on the UC Learning Center:

- 1. What Is Implicit Bias
- 2. The Impact of Implicit Bias
- 3. Managing the Influence of Implicit Bias
- 4. Awareness
- 5. Common Forms of Bias
- 6. Managing the Influence of Implicit Bias: Mindfulness And Conscious De-Biasing
- 7. Managing Implicit Bias In the Hiring Process

Appendix 4: Academic Senate Membership

Senate Members	Non Senate Members
Professor	Adjunct Professor
Professor In Residence	Visiting Professor
Professor of Clinical "X"	Clinical Professor* (compensated)
Acting Professor	Adjunct Associate Professor
Associate Professor	Visiting Associate Professor
Associate Professor In Residence	Associate Clinical Professor* (compensated)
Associate Professor of Clinical "X"	Adjunct Assistant Professor
Acting Associate Professor	Acting Assistant Professor
Studio Professor (In Residence)	Visiting Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor	Assistant Clinical Professor (compensated)
Assistant Professor in Residence	Lecturers without Security of Employment
Assistant Professor of Clinical "X"	Visiting Senior Lecturer
Instructor	Adjunct Senior Lecturer
Instructor In Residence	Associate Researcher
	Researcher
Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment	
Lecturer with Security of Employment	
Sr. Lecturer with Security of Employment	
The Chancellor	
All Vice Chancellors	
The Registrar	
The University Librarian	
All Emeriti who held any of the above titles	

http://senate.ucla.edu/about/senate-service#academic-senate-membership